



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/925,362	08/09/2001	Reem Safadi	80113-0127 (D2457)	4433

23353 7590 09/29/2004

RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
LION BUILDING
1233 20TH STREET N.W., SUITE 501
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

VO, TIM T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2112

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/925,362

Applicant(s)

SAFADI, REEM

Examiner

Tim T. Vo

Art Unit

2112

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on amendment filed on 6/28/04.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 6-18 and 23-27 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 19-22, 52 and 53 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 28-51 and 54 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 June 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2112

Election/Restrictions

1. Newly submitted claims 28-51 and 54 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons:
Newly submitted claims 28-51 and 54 are directed to Computer to computer session/connection establishing is classified under class 709 subclass 227.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 28-51 and 54 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Part III DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant(s)

This application has been examined. Claims 1-54 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Art Unit: 2112

2. Claim 53 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Candelore patent number 6,298,400.

As for claim 53, Candelore teaches a system for providing a function to a host terminal comprising:

Means for interfacing a point of deployment (POD) module and the host terminal (see figure 2, and column 4 lines 18-20, PDO 250 is connecting to the host 210);

Means for sharing a memory between both the POD module and the host terminal through the means for interfacing (see figure 1, 150 and column 3 line 1-6).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5, 19-22 and 52-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Candelore in view of Terada et al. patent number 4,447,871 referred hereinafter "Terada".

As for claims 1, 19 and 52, Candelore teaches an apparatus and a method for providing a function to a host terminal (see figure 2);

a point of deployment (POD) module that can be connected to the host (see figure 2, and column 4 lines 18-20, PDO 250 is connecting to the host 210); and

an interface between the POD module and the host (see figure 2, interface 240 is in between the POD 250 and host 210).

Candelore does not expressly teach the interface providing Direct Memory Access (DMA). However, an interface providing DMA is well known in the art as taught by Terada (column 4 lines 26-36). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Terada into the teachings of Candelore because Terada would increase system performance because the DMA would share the transfer work load from the CPU of Candelore, thus the CPU is free to handle other processes and therefore having the DMA incorporated would increase the system performance.

As for claims 2 and 20, Candelore teaches the interface integrates the POD module and the host if the host has a given characteristic, and wherein the interface does not integrated the POD module and host if the host does not have the given characteristic (see column 1 lines 14-41, wherein the CA receives multiple transport streams and determines whether the host has the right to receive the service).

As for claims 3 and 21, Candelore teaches the given characteristic indicates that the host is an authorized host (see column 1 lines 14-41 and column 58-62).

As for claims 4 and 22, Candelore teaches the direct memory access transfer and a shared memory between the POD module and the host (see figure 1, 150 and column 3 line 1-6).

As for claim 5, Candelore teaches comprising a memory having at least one of a first memory portion in the POD and a second memory portion in the host (see column 5

lines 58-62, wherein there are buffers in the POD and the host in order to be received and transmit data).

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 6-18 and 23-27 are allowable over the prior of records.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tim T. Vo whose telephone number is 703-308-5862. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Rinehart can be reached on 703-305-4815. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



09/22/2004

Tim T. Vo
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2112